

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/606,037	ELLIOTT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nicholas Augustine	2179	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Nicholas Augustine. (3)_____

(2) Mark Nemen. (4)_____

Date of Interview: 17 December 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 55.

Identification of prior art discussed: Blaze Tray Audio.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner has provided and noted hotkeys are provided in version 3.0 of Blaze Tray Audio which does not require to have perspective of the application in order to operate it. Further possible amendments were discussed in the direction of claiming to the actual presentation of the media software presented in the figures which shown are a plurality of media controls that are placed in a taskbar for the user to operate the application without it overlapping other applications running on the users desktop, such media controls as stop, play, pause, skip, volume, video, etc are all relevant and sought to be important media controls to be available and presented to the user as believed by the Examiner and Applicant.